

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 17 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 – 17 were rejected in the Office Action mailed on May 26, 2006.

Claims 8 and 9 were objected to as not further limiting claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that it is a composition containing several ingredients, including vinyl functional polydimethyl siloxane. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claims 8 and 9.

Claims 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claims 3 and 6 have been amended to address the Examiner's rejections. Specifically, claims 3 and 6 have been amended to clarify the basis of the recited molecular weights. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 6 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1 – 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As set forth above, claim 1 has been amended to clearly indicate that it is a composition and is not limited solely to a polymer. Applicant has further amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner by replacing "silicone hydrogen groups" with "silicon-bound hydrogen atoms." Claim 2 has been amended to clarify that the dimethylsiloxane contains vinyl groups at each terminus. The Examiner's rejection of claim 7 is believed to be addressed by the amendment to claim 1. Finally, claim 10 has been cancelled and the amendment to claim 1 provides proper antecedent basis for the "silicon hydrocarbon crosslinking agent" of claim 11. Accordingly, in view of the amendments it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 – 9 and 11 – 17 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner indicated that claims 7 and 9 – 11 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants are grateful for this indication. Claim 1 has been amended to include substantially the subject matter of allowable claim 10. Claim 10 has been cancelled. Claim 11 has been amended so that it is now dependent upon claim 1.

Claims 1 – 5, 8 – 9 and 12 – 15 were rejected as under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,339,564, issued to Okamura. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 10. The remainder of the rejected claims are either directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 1. Accordingly, in view of the amendment, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 – 5, 8 – 9 and 12 – 15 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Okamura.

Claims 1 – 5, 8 – 9 and 12 – 15 were rejected as under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,369,185, issued to Amako. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 10. The remainder of the rejected claims are either directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 1. Accordingly, in view of the amendment, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 – 5, 8 – 9 and 12 – 15 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Amako.

Claim 6 was rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Amako. Claim 6 is indirectly dependent upon allowable claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Amako.

Claims 1 and 5 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over co-pending patent application 10/901,713. Applicants are herewith submitting a terminal disclaimer with respect to the co-pending application. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the double patenting rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. If there are any issues that the Examiner wishes to discuss, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted



Charles W. Almer

Reg. No. 36,731

Tel. No. 908 707-3738

National Starch and Chemical Company
10 Finderne Avenue
Bridgewater, NJ 08807